

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are in the application. Claims 1, 8 and 13 are in independent form. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is objected to because the word "throughout" in the last line is misspelled. Claim 1 has been amended to correct the typographical error. Applicant requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. The Examiner states that the claim contains subject matter that was not described in an enabling manner. Applicant responds as follows.

Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of original claim 1, as amended to delete reference numbers, correct the typographical error noted by the Examiner, and to delete extraneous reference a wide field of view 'up to a complete sphere.'

Fig. 11, as described beginning at application page 20, line 14, describes "an alternative embodiment of the present invention, comprising four sensors, 10, 16, 18 and 20, in place in a rotatable drum 2." As described beginning at page 20, line 21, "In operation, with the drum rotating, each sensor would scan an object in the surrounding view at a slightly different time. By the addition of digital delays, these scans can be recorded adjacently, to produce an apparently continuous image." Moreover, Fig. 12 shows how a composite image is assembled from the data coming from the sensors, with the additional scans produced by said duplicates so that they appear interleaved with the scans produced by the original line scan sensors.

Applicant submits that with reference to Fig. 11 and its description the "placing duplicates of said line scan devices in rotated positions around said optical axis" recited in claim 2 is clearly shown and described. With reference to Fig. 12 and its description, the "adjusting the timing of the recording of the additional scans produced by said duplicates so that they appear interleaved with the scans produced by the original line scan sensors" is clearly shown and

described. Applicant submits therefore, that the subject matter of claim 2 is described in an enabling manner and requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 1 is rejected for obviousness under 35 USC 103(a) over Keast et al. (US Pat, No. 5,721,585) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art. Claim 3 is rejected for obviousness under 35 USC 103(a) over Keast et al. in view of Applicant's admitted prior art, and further in view of Leske (US Pat, No. 6,404,146). The Examiner states that Keast et al. discloses various features recited in claim 1, but does not disclose "aligning at least two line scan devices within the field of view such that their optical axes are in the same plane, separated, approximately parallel, and pointed in the same direction." The Examiner cites references disclosed in the Background section of the application as describing these features. Applicant responds as follows.

Claim 1 is amended to delete reference numbers in the claim and to change "the same plane" to "a common plane" to avoid a potential interpretation of a lack of antecedent basis for the recited plane. Also, the phrase "up to a complete sphere"

Amended claim 1 recites the subject matter of original claim 3, now cancelled, and further recites that the adjusting of the convergence of the stereoscopic image by digital delays is performed according to distance between the line scan devices and an object in the field of view. This subject matter is described in the application at page 16, lines 6-15, page 17, lines 14-20 and page 18, lines 1-11.

In the rejection of claim 3, the Examiner cited Leske as disclosing a convergence control device. Applicant notes that Leske is directed to providing two-dimensional convergence correction for a color cathode ray tube (CRT). Leske provides no teaching or suggestion relating to convergence of stereoscopic images in a field of view and, more particularly, provides no teaching or suggestion of adjusting the convergence of the stereoscopic image according to distance between the line scan devices and an object in the field of view. The distance between the guns and the screen in a CRT are fixed. Leske

provides no hint of accommodating distance of an object in the field of view in a convergence adjustment. Applicant submit, therefore, that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited references and requests that the claim be allowed.

Added claim 4-7 depend from claim 1 and recited subject matter shown and described in the application. For example, the subject matter of claim 4 is shown in Figs. 1 and 2. The subject matter of claim 5 is shown in Fig. 3. The subject matter of claim 6 is shown in Fig. 14. The subject matter of claim 7 was recited in original claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 4-7 are allowable as depending from patentably distinct claim 1.

Added independent claim 8 recites subject matter substantially analogous to amended claim 1, but without the specific performance ranges. Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentably distinct from the cited references for the reasons set forth above in reference to claim 1. Added claims 9-12 depend from claim 8 and are analogous to added claims 2 and 4-6. Added independent claim 13 recites a device with features analogous to those recited in claim 8. Added claims 15-18 are analogous to claims 9-12. Added claim 14 recites a rangefinder described in the application at page 16, lines 6-15. Added claim 19 recites a feature shown in Fig. 10, and added claim 20 recites a feature shown in Figs. 15 and 16.

Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

IPSOLON LLP  
111 SW COLUMBIA #710  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97201  
TEL. (503) 249-7066  
FAX (503) 249-7068

Respectfully Submitted,



Mark M. Meininger  
Registration No. 32,428